

## **EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

### **1. Task Order Selection:**

#### **1.1 Basis for Task Order Award:**

The government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, and Cost/Price. This is a best value task order selection. The task order will be awarded to the offeror whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by the solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the offeror who gives the Air Force the greatest confidence that it will best meet or exceed the requirements affordably. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the technical superiority and/or overall business approach of the higher priced offeror outweighs the cost difference. To arrive at a task order selection decision, the SSA will integrate the task order selection team's evaluations of the evaluation factors and subfactors(described below). While the Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. The Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion.

#### **1.2 Rejection of Unrealistic Offers:**

The government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions, or unrealistically high or low in price when compared to government estimates or competitive market prices, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

### **2. Evaluation Factors:**

#### **2.1 Evaluation Factors and Subfactors and their Relative Order of Importance:**

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with AFFARS 5352.216-9001, Awarding Orders Under Multiple Award Contracts (May 1996), Alternate II (Deviation, Dec 2000). Award will be made to the offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and subfactors described below. The evaluation factors are listed below in descending order of importance.

- Factor 1: Mission Capability
  - Subfactor 1: Unscheduled Maintenance
  - Subfactor 2: RSP

Subfactor 3: Product Baseline Development  
 Subfactor 4: Open Discrepancies

Factor 2: Proposal Risk

Factor 3: Cost/Price

## 2.2 Importance of Cost/Price:

The evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price; however, cost/price will contribute substantially to the selection decision.

## 2.3 Factor and Subfactor Rating:

Proposals will be evaluated using the Delphi Method. This method provides a technique for quantifying subjective or qualitative data for analysis purposes, and offers a procedure for achieving a consensus among a group of knowledgeable persons. Each evaluator will independently evaluate each proposal using the Delphi worksheet depicted in table 2.3-1 below. A numerical rating from "0" to "5" will be assigned to each subfactor under the mission capability factor. The numerical rating represents how well the offeror's proposal meets the C-5 MTD mission capability subfactor requirements in accordance with the explanation of how the subfactor will be evaluated in paragraph 2.3.1, taking into consideration proposal risk. Proposal risk will be integrated into the assessment of each mission capability subfactor as described in paragraph 4. Each offeror's effective value for each criterion will be calculated by multiplying the assigned numerical rating by the corresponding system weight factor. The independent assessments of each proposal will be used as a basis to reach a group consensus and final effective value for each criterion. Each offeror's total score will be calculated by totaling the final effective value for each criterion. The highest total score represents the highest technically ranked proposal.

**Table 2.3-1 – Delphi Worksheet**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>EC</b>	<b>SWF</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>
Unscheduled Maintenance	M	10					
RSP	M	9					
Product Baseline Development	M	10					
Open Discrepancies	M	6					
<b>Total</b>							

EC = Evaluation Class associated with each criterion/requirement. Acceptable values are Mandatory ("M") or Desirable ("D").

SWF = System Weight Factor used in establishing the criterion's/requirement's relative importance to the Air Force. Values range from 1 to 10, with 10 representing the highest degree of importance.

### **2.3.1 Factor 1 – Mission Capability:**

#### **Subfactor 1 – Unscheduled Maintenance:**

Proposals will be evaluated upon offeror's approach to meet the unscheduled maintenance response times. Planning, scheduling, staffing and repair procedures will be considered. The offeror's approach will be evaluated to determine viability and mitigation of risk.

#### **Subfactor 2 – RSP**

Proposals will be evaluated upon offeror's approach to develop a viable and economic RSP. Consideration will be given to the offeror's strategy for management, maintenance, and updating the RSP spares package. Additionally, evaluation will be made of the offeror's approach toward the C-5 data library with consideration of the offeror's plan to identify and correct deficiencies. The offeror's approach will be evaluated to determine viability and mitigation of risk.

#### **Subfactor 3 – Product Baseline Development:**

Offeror's approach for re-establishing the maintenance training device's individual product baselines will be evaluated. Consideration will be given to the offeror's approach for configuration management, control, and status accounting with emphasis on their plan to evaluate and correct the C-5 MTD situation. The offeror's approach will be evaluated to determine viability and mitigation of risk.

#### **Subfactor 4 – Open Discrepancies:**

Proposals will be evaluated upon the offeror's technical approach to close all C-5 MTD open and initial discrepancies. Focus will be on the offeror's plan and utilization of resources to realistically meet the 210 day repair performance period. Offeror's recognition of risks and the mitigation thereof will also be evaluated.

### **2.3.2 Proposal Risk:**

Proposal Risk will be evaluated at the Mission Capability subfactor level. The Proposal Risk assessment focuses on the risks and weaknesses associated with an offeror's proposed approach and includes an assessment of the potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Government oversight, as well as the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. For each identified risk, the assessment also addresses the offeror's proposal for mitigating the risk and why that approach is or is not manageable.

**2.3.3 Factor 3 – Cost/Price:**

a. The offeror's cost/price will be evaluated for award purposes, based upon the total proposed price for the basic year, all option years, all option CLINs, and the FFP fully burdened composite labor rates provided in the Labor Rate Matrix in Attachment 3 in the model order. The pricing team will multiply the established estimated annual government hours for each labor category shown in Attachment 10 in the model task order, to the fully burdened rates proposed by the offerors. The pricing team will then calculate a total fixed hourly rate price for the basic year and each option year by adding the total annual price for each labor category. The same hours will be used to evaluate each offeror's proposal. The total proposed price for each offeror will be calculated by adding the total fixed hourly rate prices for each year to the price of all other line items.

b. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

c. The offeror's cost/price proposal will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404, in order to determine if it is reasonable.

d. In accordance with FAR 15.403-1(b), the Government may require submission of information other than cost or pricing data to the extent necessary to determine price reasonableness. When adequate price competition exists, generally no additional information is necessary to determine the reasonableness of price.

e. Price analysis will be used to determine if the prices for contract line items, including options, are unbalanced. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total solicitation effort price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or under-stated as demonstrated by the application of price analysis techniques. Unbalanced pricing may increase performance risk and result in a higher proposal risk rating or the offer may be rejected if the Government determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government (FAR 15.404-1(g)).